

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/563,610	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ESKELINEN, EERO	
	<b>Examiner</b> ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL.

(3) Naphtali Matlis, Reg. No. 61,592.

(2) Shahid Alam.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 12 February 2010

**Time:** 430pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*102 rejection*

Claims discussed:

*1 and 3*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Singh*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Examiner proposed an examiner's amendment to allow claims by incorporating the limitations of claim 3 into independent claim 1. Applicant's representative did not agree to the amendment, so a rejection will be issued.*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Alexandria Bromell/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2167  
 February 12, 2010

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)